



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/575,298	01/29/2007	Frederic Noelle	40202	3136
116	7590	09/29/2009	EXAMINER	
PEARNE & GORDON LLP			LEYSON, JOSEPH S	
1801 EAST 9TH STREET				
SUITE 1200			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CLEVELAND, OH 44114-3108			1791	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/29/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/575,298	NOELLE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JOSEPH LEYSON	1791	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 January 2007.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 7-12 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 7-12 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 7-12 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/12/06.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

Arrangement of the Specification

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

- (a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
- (b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
- (c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
- (d) THE NAMES OF THE PARTIES TO A JOINT RESEARCH AGREEMENT.
- (e) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC.
- (f) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
 - (1) Field of the Invention.
 - (2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
- (g) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.
- (h) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).
- (i) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.
- (j) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (k) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (l) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

Claim Objections

2. Claims 7-12 are objected to because of the following informalities: in claim 7, line 7, "the calender" should be changed to --a calendar-- for antecedent basis clarity. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 7-9 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Radwanski et al. (US 4,879,170) in view of Putnam et al. (US 6,321,425).

Radwanski et al. (US 4,879,170) disclose a nonwoven production machine comprising a spun-bond tower 4 for depositing filaments as a web onto an upper run of a first conveyor 30, a first means comprising a drum (upstream drum 34) for forwarding the web from the first conveyor 30 to a first water jet consolidation unit (upstream 36)

along a path having a direction other than that of the upper run of the first conveyor 30 and a deflection means comprising a roll (not labeled but shown in fig. 1 along the web path between the drums 34) for deflecting the web indirectly to an application unit 38, 52, 54 for applying a product to the web with interposition of a second consolidation unit (downstream 36), the roll defining a second conveyor for forwarding the web leaving the first consolidation unit to the second consolidation unit, and wherein the application unit comprises a station for applying a product 38, a drying station 52 and a wind-up station 54. However, Radwanski et al. (US 4,879,170) does not disclose a calender, as recited by the instant claims.

Putnam et al. (US 6,321,425) disclose a nonwoven production machine comprising a spun-bond tower (i.e., col. 2, lines 35-48) for depositing filaments as a web onto an upper run of a first conveyor (not labeled but shown at the leftmost side of fig. 1), and a calender (labeled calender in fig. 1) to provide a lightly bonded precursor web (i.e., col. 4, lines 41-58).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the machine of Radwanski et al. (US 4,879,170) with a calender, as disclosed by Putnam et al. (US 6,321,425), because such a modification would provide a lightly bonded precursor web. Note that the deflection means would be downstream of the calender in this prior art combination. Further, note that the two different pathways for the deflections means is instantly claimed in the alternative, and thus one pathway can read upon the instant claims. In other words, the two different pathways are NOT positively claimed together in ONE machine.

6. Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Radwanski et al. (US 4,879,170) in view of Putnam et al. (US 6,321,425) as applied to claims 7-9 and 12 above, and further in view of Brooks et al. (US 4,623,575).

Brooks et al. (US 4,623,575) disclose a nonwoven production machine comprising an expressing means upstream of the application unit 25, 40, 42, wherein the expressing means comprises a (third) conveyor 12 and a device 15, 20 for creating a vacuum.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to further modify the machine with an expressing means, as disclosed by Brooks et al. (US 4,623,575), because such a modification would enable expressing of fluids from the web

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Noelle (US 7,500,293), Noelle (US 2001/0005926) and Vuillaume et al. (US 2002/0168910) are cited as of interest.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JOSEPH LEYSON whose telephone number is (571)272-5061. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9AM-5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gupta Yogendra can be reached on (571) 272-1316. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Robert B. Davis/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1791

/J. L./
Examiner, Art Unit 1791